

INDEX TO
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON D. C. 13 December 1956
9:30 a. m.

	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Convene, Room 7000, Interior Bldg.	1
2. Minutes of Previous Meeting	1
3. Date of next meeting	1
4. Report on action taken on Shipstead-Luce applications since the meeting on 19 November 1956.	1
5. Report of action taken on Old Georgetown Act Applications since 19 November meeting	.1,2
6. Discussions	2,3,4
a. Summary.	.2
b. Legislation - Letter to Honorable Frank Thompson regarding proposed legislation to expand the Commission of Fine Arts.	2
c. P.L. 808/81st Congress. Disregard of recommendations made by board of Arch. Consultants and Commission of Fine Arts on building applications.	2,3
d. Firehouse #32 at 24th and Irving Street, S.E. exemplified the circumstances just discussed in thepreceding paragraph	3,4
7. Bridge/Tunnel at Constitution Avenue over the Potomac River - status.	4,5
8. Site of the Pershing Memorial (Joint meeting with the National Capital Planning Commission	5
9. Shipstead-Luce Submissions (Preliminary)	
a. Vanguard Computing Center (International Business Machines Corporation 615 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.. . . .	5,6
b. Proposed Building for Associated General Contractors on the Northeast Corner of 20th and E Sts, N.W.	6
10. Department of the Interior, National Capital Parks (The Netherlands Carillon Tower	.7
11. Shipstead-Luce Submissions (formal)	7

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON D. C. 13 December 1956
9:30 a. m.

A regular meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its offices in the Interior Department building on 13 December 1956 with the following members in attendance:

Mr. David E. Finley (afternoon session)
Mrs. Emily Muir
Mr. Douglas Orr
Mr. Elbert Peets
Mr. William Graves Perry

Mr. L. R. Wilson, Secretary, was also present.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a. m. by the Vice Chairman, Mr. Orr, in the absence of the Chairman, David E. Finley. The Secretary stated that no minutes of the previous meeting were ready for presentation, because the volume of the current business in the office had prevented their preparation. The minutes will be completed as soon as practicable.

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts would be held on 24 January 1957. It was also agreed that because February is a short month, there would not be another meeting of the Commission until 14 March 1957.

4. Report on action taken on Shipstead-Luce applications since the meeting on 19 November 1956.

The Secretary called attention to Appendix I listing the Shipstead-Luce applications which had been processed since the last meeting of the Commission on 19 November, all of which had been approved. It was moved, seconded and unanimously carried that approval be given to the action taken as indicated on Appendix I. (Exhibit A)

5. Report of action taken on Old Georgetown Act Applications since 19 November meeting.

The Secretary reported that of the 35 submissions under the Old Georgetown Act, since 19 November 1956, the Georgetown Board of Consultants had approved 32, disapproved 1, accepted two for record

purposes only since the work had already been completed before submission, and held 1 pending revision in plans for restoration of a dormer window. After discussion of the actions taken, it was moved, seconded and unanimously carried that approval be given to the action taken by the Board of Georgetown Consultants as indicated on Appendix II. (Exhibit B)

6. Discussions

a. The Secretary gave a brief summary of the items on the Order of Business.

b. Legislation -Letter to Honorable Frank Thompson regarding proposed legislation to expand the Commission of Fine Arts.

There was general discussion of the proposal of Congressman Frank Thompson, Jr. to expand the functions of the Commission of Fine Arts and to increase its membership from 7 to 11. It was the consensus of opinion that Congressman Thompson's attitude indicated an unwillingness on his part to recognize the duties and functions of the Commission of Fine Arts as set forth in the Enabling Act, and a determination to superimpose another body on the Commission which would make the functions of the present Commission subordinate. It was agreed that Mr. Thompson has ignored the suggestions made in a letter from the Chairman, dated 30 November 1956, suggesting that instead of setting up a new agency, money be appropriated for agencies already existing in Government which are qualified to carry out his suggestion for a better and more wide-spread art program. It was agreed further, that the present Commission of Fine Arts should not be enlarged from 7 to 11 members, and that a letter, as simple and direct as possible, be sent by the Chairman to Congressman Thompson stating the views of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts to this effect. The opinion of the members was that music, drama, and a broad cultural program should not be added to the present functions of the Commission. (EXHIBITS C & D)

c. P.L. 808/81st Congress. Disregard of recommendations made by board of Arch. Consultants and Commission of Fine Arts on building applications

The Chairman, recalling the concern expressed at the last meeting by Mr. Walter Macomber regarding the tendency of the D.C. Commissioners to ignore the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, read a letter he had written to the President of the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia, in which he expressed the concern felt by the members of the Commission and by the Board of Architectural Consultants for Georgetown over the fact that their

recommendations on submissions for advice had been overruled. He mentioned, for example, the proposed storage garage for the Golden Commissary Corporation. He asked the Board of Commissioners to send him a statement of explanation as to why the Commission's recommendations have not been supported. The members approved the text of the letter and asked the Chairman to send it. They also asked the Secretary to show a copy of the letter to Mr. Macomber. (EXHIBIT E)

Mr. David N. Yerkes, of the firm of Deigert and Yerkes, architects, was invited at his suggestion to appear before the meeting for a discussion of the attitude of the District Officials in making changes in plans and specifications for District Public Buildings after the designs have been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts and submitted to the District Officials. He stated that this was becoming a very serious problem to the Architects of the District and that the District Chapter of the American Institute of Architects was also concerned about it. He stated that certain District Officials had the right to refuse and were refusing to use any desirable material recommended by the architect if its use resulted in increasing the building cost by as little as several hundred dollars, even though such substitutions of a poorer material would certainly result, and had resulted, in an inferior building design. The members of the commission considered that there was little that they as a body could do beyond a strong recommendation, but suggested that if the District Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, and all the architects in Washington, would try to work out something with the District Commissioners it would be more effective than unilateral action on the part of the Commission, which shares their concern in this matter. Mr. Yerkes thanked the members for the opportunity of discussing the problem and said they would see what could be done along these lines and then withdrew from the meeting.

After his departure, it was suggested by Mr. Orr that, since there are new department heads at the District Building, perhaps it would be well to invite them to attend a meeting of the Commission and have a talk with them about what we would expect in the way of cooperation from them in carrying out the intent of the designs without making cost factors the criteria. The new department heads are Mr. Roy E. Guard, Supervising Architect, Department of Buildings and Grounds, who succeeded Mr. Merrill Coe, now retired; and Mr. John A. Blaser, Director of Buildings and Grounds.

d. Firehouse #32 at 24th and Irving Street, S.E. exemplified the circumstances just discussed in the preceding paragraph.

The Secretary stated that when the plans for this small modern style building were submitted December 9, 1955 to the Commission, there was considerable discussion in regard to carrying out the design.

Subsequently a letter was written to the Supervising Architect stating that the Commission approved the design, and felt that the architects had done an excellent job, but that the design was of a kind that required careful attention to materials in execution.

The letter to the Supervising Architect, dated 20 December 1955 was read; and also a letter written to General Thomas A. Lane, Engineer Commissioner for the District of Columbia, dated 11 Dec 1956, from Deigert and Yerkes, Architects was noted. Further action was postponed awaiting word from Mr. Yerkes. (EXHIBITS F, G & H)

7. Bridge/Tunnel at Constitution Avenue over the Potomac River - status.

Mr. Harry Thompson, Director, National Capital Parks, appeared before the Commission and explained to the members the alternate designs for the projected bridge and/or tunnel starting near the end of Constitution Avenue, together with the approaches for each method of crossing, at Virginia and District banks of the Potomac River. Mr. Perry asked Mr. Thompson whether he could clarify the opinion held by many opponents to the tunnel, that the approaches for it would be much more difficult to plan and construct than those for the bridge. Mr. Thompson said he could and, in explanation, then showed plans for a bridge which had been approved by the National Capital Planning Commission in November, 1955, on the assumption that, if there were to be a bridge at this site, these were the plans to be followed. Mr. Thompson then showed the members a plan for the tunnel which had also been worked out in conjunction with the Planning Commission, the District Highway Engineers, and the National Capital Parks. The latter plan was also formally approved by the National Capital Planning Commission in April 1955. The plan indicated that the bridge would carry six lanes of traffic and required more roads and structures for the approaches than the four-lane tunnel.

Mr. Thompson also stated that he based his opinion on the report of Wilbur Smith Associates, who were retained by the National Capital Planning Commission, to make a study of the traffic needs for both sides of the river and to make a recommendation for handling it. The study recommended either a bridge or a tunnel to handle the 40,000 vehicles a day which should be allowed to cross the river at this location in addition to the 60,000 now using the present Memorial Bridge, because of the inability of the streets of Washington to absorb a larger number of cars. They also recommended that rather than increase the volume of traffic in the Lincoln Memorial area it would be better to disperse the motor traffic by building bridges in other locations such as the Three Sisters Islands, Cabin John, Jones Point, and Roaches Run. After considerable discussion of

these points the members thanked Mr. Thompson for his explanation of the plans for the bridge/tunnel and adjourned to meet with the National Capital Planning Commission in joint session.

8. Site of the Pershing Memorial (Joint meeting with the National Capital Planning Commission)

Mr. Bartholomew, Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, greeted the members of the Commission of Fine Arts and then called upon Mr. John Nolen, Director of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Nolen stated that the matter under discussion was the selection of a site on which to erect a memorial to General John J. Pershing. He stated further his understanding that the Commission of Fine Arts had indicated to the American Battle Monuments Commission that it would have no objection to the selection of the site at 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. provided the memorial took the form of a civic monument, for example a fountain. Because other uses had also been suggested for this important area, the suggestion was made that a Joint Committee composed of representatives from the Commission of Fine Arts, the American Battle Monuments Commission, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Park Service, be formed to study the matter and make recommendations. Following a general discussion about the site and its importance and the advisability of forming a Joint Committee to study the problem, General Lane, Engineer Commissioner for the District of Columbia, said he was reluctant to approve such a measure. After further consideration, agreement was reached and General Lane moved that the Chairmen of the various Commissions be instructed to appoint such a representative to serve on a Joint Committee and that the Committee be instructed to bring in a report at the next meeting of the Committee and that the Committee be instructed to bring in a report at the next meeting of the National Capital Planning Commission. The motion was seconded and unanimously carried. Members of the Commission of Fine Arts then retired and reconvened in their own Conference Room, whereupon, the Vice Chairman, Mr. Orr, appointed Mr. Perry to represent the Commission of Fine Arts on the Joint Committee for the selection of a site for the Pershing Memorial. The Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission was informed verbally of this action.

9. Shipstead-Luce Submissions (Preliminary)

a. Vanguard Computing Center (International Business Machines Corporation 615 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.)

In order to hasten the action on a building permit, Mr. E. H. Corey, Coordinator of Personnel for the International

Business Machines Corporation, and Mr. Horace W. Peaslee, his architectural consultant, appeared before the Commission to explain the projected design IBM was filing to remodel a one-story building at 615 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.. Mr. Corey stated that the building had been leased by the International Business Machines Corporation to be used for officespace and to house and display electronic office equipment used in connection with Project Vanguard during the International Geophysical year starting July 1, 1957, and continuing for the next 18 months. Scientists and astronomers from all parts of the world were trying to observe the planets of the universe, particularly, it was hoped, an artificial satellite to be launched by the United States Government in July 1957.

As the remodelling of the Pennsylvania Avenue frontage and entrance was involved, the members of the Commission decided that they would like to inspect the building before deciding and adjourned to proceed there. When the Commission reconvened at 2 o'clock, the proposed design was not considered appropriate. In a letter to IBM, it was recommended that the design be revised and that consideration be given to repairing and remodelling the show windows and existing limestone front of the building, instead of the glazed brick design that was submitted. Resubmission of a revised design less commercial in character was desired. (EXHIBIT I)

b. Proposed Building for Associated General Contractors on the
Northeast Corner of 20th and E Sts., N.W.

At the request of the architects, who wished to explain their plans, Mr. Earl V. Gauger, of Chatelain, Gauger and Nolan, Architects, was invited to come to the meeting. He was accompanied by Mr. Welton A. Snow, Manager, Building Division, Associated General Contractors, and Mr. J. K. Bowersox of the Building Division of Associated General Contractors.

Mr. Gauger presented plans for the building which is to be the National Headquarters of the Associated General Contractors on land owned by the AGC. He said that the building would be designed to conform to, in general, the character of the American Red Cross Building which stands across 20th street. A staff of about 55 people will occupy the building. After a long, detailed discussion of the type, color and texture of materials and design of the openings projects for the building, Mr. Gauger stated that the building would be entirely air conditioned and that special care would be taken to incorporate the cooling tower architecturally in the penthouse. The members asked Mr. Gauger to submit drawings showing how these two items would be handled before giving final approval to the entire design. They also had misgivings about the effect of the rise of green enamelled spandrels and green glass in the window openings.

10. Department of the Interior, National Capital Parks (The
Netherlands Carillon Tower

Mr. Harry Thompson, Associate Superintendent, accompanied by Mr. William Haussmann, Architect of the National Capital Parks staff, and Mr. J. A. vanHouten, Counselor for Press and Cultural Affairs, the Netherlands Embassy, met with the members for a discussion of the design and character of the tower in which will hang the Carillon given to the United States by the Netherlands. The Commission believed that its location on the Nevius Tract created special problems that will have to be solved before the design can be approved. After long discussion of the form, the height, the material and the relationship to nearby memorials, the Chairman was requested to discuss the problem with the Ambassador of the Netherlands, giving him the views of the Commission, and to report back to the Commission at the next meeting on 24 January.

11. Shipstead-Luce Submissions (formal)

Appendix 3 listed 12 submissions under the Shipstead-Luce Act, and the list was approved as submitted. (EXHIBIT J)

The meeting adjourned at 5 o'clock.


L. R. Wilson
Secretary

APPENDIX 1

4. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 19 NOVEMBER MEETING:

- SL 1923 5704 Oregon Ave., NW (1½-story, brick residence) for Samuel Badian. Approved revised drawings dtd. 11/16/56, 12 Dec. 1956.
- SL 1924 5708 Oregon Ave., NW (1½-story, brick residence) for Samuel Badian. Approved revised drawings dtd. 11/16/56, 12 Dec. 1956.
- SL 1928 8145 East Beach Dr., NW (2-story, brick dwelling) for Redwood Terrace Estates, Inc. Approved as revised in elevation drawings dtd. 12/10/56, 12 Dec. 1956.
- SL 1930 5720 Oregon Ave., NW (1 single-faced, 25 sq-ft construction sign) for Samuel Badian. Approved as temporary sign, 12 Dec. 1956.
- SL 1932 300 Pa. Ave., SE (Change copy of 2 existing neon signs) for American Building Assn. Approved design dtd. 12/6/56, 10 Dec. 1956.

THEORY OF THE EARTH

1870

- 1. The Earth is a sphere of about 8000 miles in diameter.
- 2. The Earth is composed of a solid crust, a liquid mantle, and a solid core.
- 3. The crust is about 30 miles thick.
- 4. The mantle is about 2200 miles thick.
- 5. The core is about 1500 miles in radius.
- 6. The Earth is covered by a layer of water about 7000 feet deep.
- 7. The atmosphere is about 50 miles thick.
- 8. The Earth is covered by a layer of soil about 10 feet deep.
- 9. The Earth is covered by a layer of vegetation about 10 feet deep.
- 10. The Earth is covered by a layer of animals about 10 feet deep.

5. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 19 NOVEMBER MEETING:

<u>NO</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
1670	2831 M St., NW City Service Oil Co.	Repaint existing 90 sq-ft sign with new wording & design	App. for 1 sign only not to exceed 25 sq-ft; suggest dark green color be used in lieu of maroon or brown on words "100 PLUS", 11/21/56
1675	1206-30th St., NW Chas. A. Columbus	Correct all deficiencies contained in order of Board For Condem. of Insan. Bldgs. This permit does not include electrical or plumbing	App. as revised in architect's drawings dated 11/8/56, 11/21/56
1679	3233 N St., NW International Order of Odd Fellows	Remove 2 wood landings & wood steps, replace 1 only with conc. & steel (brick finish) no enlargements, no plumbing, no elec. all back of bldg. line (W. I. railing)	Approved, 11/21/56
1685	1670 Wisc. Ave., NW Sam. Bodley of Md.,	Repaint 3 exist. signs originally authorized by Permit A-12152, dtd. 9/5/50	Disapproved, total sign area must not exceed 25 sq-ft, 11/16/56
1688	1525-35th St., NW Graham Lytle	Rev. of permit #B-1671 for installation of decorative wrought iron gratings to window openings (in place)	Accepted for record purposes; already installed, 11/21/56
1690	1235-31st St., NW Helen Hill Miller	7' board (replace present fence with same material) fence	Approved, 11/21/56
1691	1230-29th St., NW Neil G. Caldwell	Replace old door with pair of French doors (in place)	Accepted for record purp's; already instal'd, 11/21/56
1692	2929 N St., NW The Edes Home (Rest Home)	Replace defective ceiling joists, rafters, sheathing. All finish cornice woodwork; also replace exist. tin roof with new on exist. open side rear porch. No chg. in size	Approved, 11/21/56
1693 R 1531	3419 Q St., NW Mrs. Mary H. Renshaw	Rev. to front elevation of structure on previously approved plan (OG 1531)	Approved, 11/21/56

EXHIBIT B

APPENDIX 2 (Continued)

<u>NO</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
1694	2805 Olive St., NW Photos Elaine P. MacDonald in 1035	Build inside fireplace, brick; build outside chimney with flue lining, 9x13; build inside chimney with flue lining, 9x13; install 1 steel sash on side of house	<u>Approved, 11/21/56</u>
1695	2703 Dumb. Ave., NW Garth Peters	Replace exist. roof with new asbestos shingle--no change in roof framing. Roof has 4 in 12 slope	<u>Approved, 11/21/56</u>
1696	3312 R St., NW Henry S. & Tamara G. Villard	Addn. to dwelling	<u>Approved, 11/27/56</u>
1697	3321 P St., NW Olga G. Foley	New windows to powder rm. Remove old basement stairway. Constr. new stairway. Erect retain. wall at rear inside. Erect 4" cin-bl. partitions to enclose furn. & powd. rms.	<u>Approved, 11/27/56</u>
1698	3001 R St., NW Oak Hill Cemetery	7' chain link fence	<u>Approved, 11/27/56</u>
1699	3327 M St., NW R 1605 Esso Standard Oil Co. (R 1328)	Revised design for gas station	<u>Approved, 11/27/56</u>
1700	1516-32nd St., NW Mr & Mrs Hugh E. Bottleson	To use Buckingham slate instead of tin on front of roof	<u>Approved for slate roof, 11/27/56</u>
1701	1100-29th St., NW See 1097 Wash. Gas Light Co.	Rearrange partitions, install accoustical ceiling, in- stall new windows, all on 1st fl.	<u>Approved. Conforms with de- sign app. in OG 1097, app. 5/3/56. 12/4/56</u>
1702	1077 Wisc. Ave., NW Mrs. Viola Smith	Correct all deficiencies contained in order of Board For Cond. of Insan. Bldgs (repair windows)	<u>App. No exterior changes in design noted, 12/4/56</u>
1703	3700 Reservoir Rd., NW Georgetown University	New addn. to Hospital (Diagnostic Bldg.)	<u>Approved, 12/4/56</u>
1704	3426 "O" St., NW Jas. J. Sullivan	Correct all deficiencies contained in the order of the Board for Condemnation of Insanitary Bldgs.	<u>App. No exterior changes in design noted, 12/4/56</u>

REPORT

TABLE

MEMO FOR RECORD

ON

22/12/11, 2011

After reading the report of the committee on the subject of the proposed amendment to the Bill, the committee has decided to recommend that the Bill be passed.

It is recommended that the Bill be passed.

22/12/11, 2011

The committee has also decided to recommend that the Bill be passed.

It is recommended that the Bill be passed.

22/12/11, 2011

The committee has also decided to recommend that the Bill be passed.

It is recommended that the Bill be passed.

22/12/11, 2011

The committee has also decided to recommend that the Bill be passed.

It is recommended that the Bill be passed.

22/12/11, 2011

The committee has also decided to recommend that the Bill be passed.

It is recommended that the Bill be passed.

22/12/11, 2011

The committee has also decided to recommend that the Bill be passed.

It is recommended that the Bill be passed.

22/12/11, 2011

The committee has also decided to recommend that the Bill be passed.

It is recommended that the Bill be passed.

22/12/11, 2011

The committee has also decided to recommend that the Bill be passed.

It is recommended that the Bill be passed.

22/12/11, 2011

The committee has also decided to recommend that the Bill be passed.

It is recommended that the Bill be passed.

22/12/11, 2011

The committee has also decided to recommend that the Bill be passed.

It is recommended that the Bill be passed.

22/12/11, 2011

The committee has also decided to recommend that the Bill be passed.

It is recommended that the Bill be passed.

APPENDIX 2 (Continued)

<u>NO</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
1705	1219-30th St., NW R. H. Muzzall	Install (5) pair shutters on front of exist. bldg. (in place)	Approved, 12/4/56
1706	1021-30th St., NW Jane Hinkle	6' split chestnut or pine gate between house & lumber shed	Approved, 12/4/56
1707	3021 N St., NW Fred. H. Brooke	Build toilet in 1st fl. & add window in west brick wall of house	Approved, 12/4/56
1708	3249 P St., NW Reginald H. Marlow	7' cedar screen fence	Approved, 12/10/56
1709	1522-32nd St., NW R 1140 Miss D. D. Ferguson	Revise Bldg. Permit #B-1559 to revise entrance steps & bld. planting box	Approved, 12/10/56
1710	1524-32nd St., NW R 1140 Miss D. D. Ferguson	Revise Bldg. Permit #1559 to revise entrance steps & build planting box	Approved, 12/10/56
1711	1526-32nd St., NW R 1297 P. R. Bickford	Revise Bldg. Permit #B-7180 to revise entrance steps & build planting box	Approved, 12/10/56
1712	1528-32nd St., NW R 1299 Wm. H. Ferguson	Revise Bldg. Permit #B-7181 to revise entrance steps & build planting box	Approved, 12/10/56
1713	1530-32nd St., NW R 1298 P. A. Ferguson	Revise Bldg. Permit B-7182 to revise entrance steps & build planting box	Approved, 12/10/56
1714	3233 N St., NW I. O. O. F.	Remove wood steps & wood platform & replace with conc. & brick. No plumbing; no electrical, all back of bldg. line	App., provided vertical bars be placed approx. 5 or 6" on centers, 12/10/56
1716	1115-30th St., NW Wash. Gas Light Co.	3-story, masonry & concrete office bldg.	App. Note window sizes have been revised as indicated in ink on draw'g., 12/10/56
1717	2517 Q St., NW R 1598 Samuel Levy	Revision to Bldg. Permit #B-17349 to raise entrance 4"	App. to raise entrance 4" only, 12/10/56

NOTICE

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

ON

02/01/51

ni) .agld ,dake 3o dno3 no erevne tieq (i) Eleant
(cealy

02/01/51

02/01/51

beis tedul 3 eulon nesved edg eni 3o dntedo dize 'd

02/01/51

02/01/51

3o lre3 doid 3e3r ni wobin dbe 3 .d3 del ni delios blid
eulon

02/01/51

02/01/51

eeu3 nesve eade 'V

02/01/51

02/01/51

.blid 3 eade eonevne ealver of 0221-34 dno3 .343 ealver
nod gndneiq

02/01/51

02/01/51

blid 3 eade eonevne ealver of 0221-34 dno3 .343 ealver
nod gndneiq

02/01/51

02/01/51

blid 3 eade eonevne ealver of 0221-34 dno3 .343 ealver
nod gndneiq

02/01/51

02/01/51

blid 3 eade eonevne ealver of 0221-34 dno3 .343 ealver
nod gndneiq

02/01/51

02/01/51

blid 3 eade eonevne ealver of 0221-34 dno3 .343 ealver
nod gndneiq

02/01/51

Leolter lelvorq .agld .doid 3 .ono3 nlt3 ealver 3 dntedo lre3 3 eade eonevne ealver of 0221-34 dno3 .343 ealver
nod gndneiq

02/01/51

02/01/51

.blid ealver eonevne ealver of 0221-34 dno3 .343 ealver
nod gndneiq

02/01/51

02/01/51

blid ealver eonevne ealver of 0221-34 dno3 .343 ealver
nod gndneiq

02/01/51

02/01/51

blid ealver eonevne ealver of 0221-34 dno3 .343 ealver
nod gndneiq

02/01/51

APPENDIX 2 (Continued)

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

ACTION

1718 2521 Q St., NW
R 1651 Samuel Levy

Revise Bldg. Permit #B-17353 to adjust steps to existing grade

App. to adjust entr. steps
to exist. grade only,
12/10/56

1719 2523 Q St., NW
R 1652 Samuel Levy

Revise Bldg. Permit #B-17352 to adjust entrance steps to
existing grade

App. to adjust entr. steps
to exist. grade only,
12/10/56

PENDING:

1681 3501 "O" St., NW
R 1498 Mrs. Marie Nongan

Revise plans issued under permit #B-15134 to install dormer
in attic roof (in place)

App. provided a 12-light
sash is installed in ex-
isting dormer. Drawing
does not appear to por-
tray actual structure &
is not therefore stamped
12/10/56

NOTES

REMARKS

DATE OF OBSERVATION

ON

degrees and minutes of ...
... of ...

... of ...
... of ...

...
...
...

... of ...
... of ...

... of ...
... of ...

...
...
...

... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

...
...
...

...

Frank Thompson, jr.
4th District New Jersey

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C.

December 11, 1956

Honorable David E. Finley
Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Based upon your splendid report of November 30 regarding my draft of a Joint Resolution "To amend the Act entitled 'An Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts'" etc., I have prepared a new measure which I hope you will consider and bring to the attention of the members of your Federal Agency. I would deeply appreciate a report on this new measure at your earliest convenience.

I cannot see how the Commission of Fine Arts can advise "generally upon questions of art" without having representatives of the living arts among its members -- that is and be fair about it. It seems to me that the present arrangement in which these arts are denied representation favors some arts to the detriment of others. This seems to be the feeling of such groups as the American Federation of Musicians, the National Music Council and other groups.

I am sending along 10 copies of a speech I have prepared for delivery at the annual convention of the American Educational Theatre Association. Please bring these copies to the attention of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts for their information.

With kind regards,

Cordially yours,

/s/ Frank Thompson, Jr.

Frank Thompson, Jr.
4th District New Jersey

COMMISSIONER OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C.

December 11, 1956

Honorable David W. E. Hill
Chairman, Committee on Education
Interior Department Building
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Mr. Hill:

Based upon your report of November 20 regarding a
draft of a Joint Resolution "To amend the law relating to
establishing a Commission on the Rights of the Child," I have
a new sense which I hope you will consider in coming to the
attention of the members of your Federal group. I would deeply
appreciate a report on this new measure in your earliest con-
venience.

I cannot see how the Commission of the Rights of the Child
"generally upon questions of law" without having representatives
of the living and among its members -- that it will be fair to
it. It seems to me that the present arrangement in which these
are denied representation favors some sort of the sentiment
of others. This seems to be the feeling of such groups as the
American Federation of Musicians, the National Music Council and
other groups.

I am sending along 10 copies of a speech I have prepared for
delivery at the annual convention of the American Educational
Theatre Association. Please bring these copies to the attention
of the members of the Commission of the Rights of the Child.

With kind regards,

Very truly yours,

(s) Frank Thompson, Jr.

85th
1st

THOMPSON OF NEW JERSEY

To amend the Act of May 17, 1910, with respect to the composition and activities of the Commission of Fine Arts.

That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act Establishing a Commission of Fine Arts", approved May 17, 1910 (40 U.S.C., sec. 104) is amended by striking out "seven well-qualified judges of the fine arts" and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven well-qualified judges of the fine arts (including the living arts of music, drama, dance, and poetry, the graphic arts, motion pictures, radio, television, literature, and the crafts)".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not be construed as affecting the terms of office of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts who are in office on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 2. Such Act of May 17, 1910, is further amended by striking out section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. The President is authorized to create such interagency committees as in his judgment may be of assistance to the commission in performing its functions under this Act. Such committees shall include individuals having special knowledge and experience in the field of the fine arts as well as individuals whose knowledge and experience in other fields will assist the commission in performing such functions. The provisions of section 214 of the Act of May 3, 1945 (31 U.S.C., sec. 691), shall be applicable to any interagency committee created pursuant to this section.

"Sec. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act."

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

4 January 1957

Dear Mr. Thompson:

I have your letter of December 11, 1956, and appreciate your kindness in sending me a copy of your new draft of a Joint Resolution "To amend the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts" by increasing the membership from seven to eleven members in order to provide representation for certain arts such as music, drama, poetry. etc.

I read your letter and enclosures to the members of the Commission at a meeting held on December 13th. After studying the text of the proposed legislation, the members asked me to say that they hoped the membership of the Commission would not be increased merely for representational purposes.

During the 45 years the Commission has been in existence, the members have been chosen, not for the purpose of representing a particular profession in the field of art but because they had professional qualifications which would be needed to advise the Federal Government in specific cases that might arise when funds are appropriated for designated purposes, such as the design and decoration of public buildings, monuments, and other structures erected by the Federal Government.

So far as I know, no case involving governmental expenditures for music, drama or ballet has ever come before the Commission for advice. Such expenditures as the Government makes for music are largely, if not entirely, confined to bands operated by the Armed Forces. The concerts given at the Library of Congress and the National Gallery of Art are financed by funds donated for the purpose or by artists who donate their services. The Commission would be glad to see the Federal Government place greater emphasis on music and ballet, especially in Washington, where private funds for such cultural activities are not adequate for their support on a scale commensurate with the importance of this city as a great world capital.

The Commission made certain recommendations in this respect in its "Report to the President on Art and Government" in 1953. In that report the Commission said:

"The Commission recommends the establishment of a music center in Washington under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. The Commission feels that the Government would be justified in erecting a building in which opera, symphony concerts, and ballet can be performed. Such a building could be erected and maintained by the Office of General Services and arrangements could be made to lease the facilities to professional organizations which might make use of the building.

THE COMMISSION ON THE ARTS
WOODWARD CLARK BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

A 100-100000

Dear Mr. Thompson:

I have your letter of October 11, 1957, and am very glad to hear in reading it a copy of your new bill of a General Education Bill. The Act establishing a Commission on the Arts and the National Endowment for the Arts is a very important step in the development of the arts in this country. I am sure that the Commission will be able to make a valuable contribution to the development of the arts in this country.

I read your letter and am glad to hear that you are planning to hold a meeting in the field of the arts. I am sure that the Commission will be able to make a valuable contribution to the development of the arts in this country. I am sure that the Commission will be able to make a valuable contribution to the development of the arts in this country.

During the 15 years the Commission has been in existence, the members have been chosen not for the purpose of representing a particular group or profession in the field of the arts but because they are persons who are interested in the development of the arts in this country. I am sure that the Commission will be able to make a valuable contribution to the development of the arts in this country.

So far as I know, no case has been made for the Commission's expenditures for music, drama or ballet. I am sure that the Commission will be able to make a valuable contribution to the development of the arts in this country. I am sure that the Commission will be able to make a valuable contribution to the development of the arts in this country.

The Commission has a certain responsibility in this regard. I am sure that the Commission will be able to make a valuable contribution to the development of the arts in this country. I am sure that the Commission will be able to make a valuable contribution to the development of the arts in this country.

The Commission has a certain responsibility in this regard. I am sure that the Commission will be able to make a valuable contribution to the development of the arts in this country. I am sure that the Commission will be able to make a valuable contribution to the development of the arts in this country.

Honorable Frank Thompson, jr.
4 January 1957

page 2

"The Federal Government has erected and maintained museums and other buildings to house and exhibit its collections of objects of artistic, historical, and scientific value for the education and enlightenment of the people of this country. It would not be out of line with this policy for the Government to erect and maintain in Washington a building for the performance and encouragement of music and for its dissemination to people throughout the country by means of radio and television."

If these recommendations should be carried out and if the Federal Government should appropriate funds for the support of opera, symphonic and other music, and ballet, as is done in some other countries, the Commission of Fine Arts would be happy to advise the Government on any questions affecting governmental operations in this field. It would not be necessary to enlarge the membership of the Commission in order to do this. The technical aspects of this problem could be handled either by a member of the Commission who would be especially qualified in the field of music, or by a special body which the Commission could establish for the purpose of advising it, as is done by the Board of Architects in carrying out the provision of the Old Georgetown Act.

I do not need to assure you that the Commission would be most happy to give advice when requested by the Federal Government or its agencies in connection with undertakings in the field of music financed by public appropriations. If you have any plans for such undertakings on the part of the Government, I hope you will give us an opportunity of discussing the matter with you, perhaps at the meeting of the Commission on January 24th. We are most appreciative of the interest and support which you give to the Government's cultural activities, all of which are of such concern to members of the Commission.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

/s/ David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Frank Thompson, jr.
House of Representatives
Washington 25, D. C.

Exhibit D

For the Commission of Line Art:

Washington 25, D. C.
House of Representatives
Honorable Frank Thompson

2 December 1996

Dear Mr. Connelley:

In September 1950, Public Law 808, 81st Congress, created a District known as Old Georgetown, and defined its boundaries. Within these boundaries, the law seeks to preserve "the type of architecture used in the National Capital in its initial years." The law names the Commission of Fine Arts as the qualified agency to decide and report to the District Commissioners as to whether the materials and exterior design for a building proposed for remodeling or erection in the Georgetown area meets the requirements of the law; and to recommend changes, if any, are "necessary and desirable", to preserve the historic and architectural character of the Old Georgetown District. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized by law 808 to take such actions as in their judgment "are right and proper" on the findings of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The law, as you know, also authorizes the Commission of Fine Arts to appoint a committee of three architects who shall serve as a Board of Review and advise the Commission of Fine Arts in writing regarding designs and plans referred to the Commission. We have, as far, been able to secure well qualified architects who for more than six years now have devoted one afternoon each week, at no expense to the Government, in performing this public service. It is, as I am sure you will agree, asking a great deal of these architects to devote so much of their time to this work without compensation. Still they are willing to do this, they believe that in every instance where their recommendations are considered either by the Commission of Fine Arts or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, they are entitled to the courtesy of a report on the matter, stating the reasons for the action taken. I think the Commission of Fine Arts is entitled to share these recommendations with the various architects, and also should consider the

Honorable Robert E. McLaughlin
3 December 1956

law permitted such a building to be erected within the Georgetown area.

When the Advisory Architects inquired of me as to the reason why the recommendations made by them and the Commission of Fine Arts had been overruled, I was unable to give the information requested. In order that the record in this case may be completed and that I may be in position to comply with what I consider to be a reasonable request on the part of the Advisory Architects, I would be glad if you will send me a statement in regard to the action of the Commissioners in this instance, and in any future cases where the recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts are overruled. Otherwise, I fear I shall have trouble in the future, as I have had in the past, in securing qualified architects to act on the Board of Review.

The Georgetown Act imposes a heavy duty upon the Commission of Fine Arts. We are conscious, however, of our responsibility in carrying out the mandate imposed by the law but feel sure we could do so with the cooperation of all concerned.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Robert E. McLaughlin
Commissioner
District of Columbia
Washington, D. C.

cc- Brig. Gen. Thomas A. Lane
Mr. Cabell Gwathmey



December 11, 1956

General T. A. Lane
District Commissioner
14th and E Streets, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear General Lane:

A question has come up concerning the design of the Fire House now under construction at 24th and Irving Streets, S.E. We believe an important principle is involved which will be raised again in other building projects, and we should like to review the facts with you. We have discussed the matter today with Mr. Blaser.

When the design of this building was approved by the Fine Arts Commission, the Commission stated in a letter to Mr. Coe: "The members considered the architects had cleverly solved the problem and had indicated promising designs for the facades. In their opinion, the success of this building will depend upon careful cooperation with the architects through the supervisory period to achieve texture and harmony of color, and careful installation of materials."

After carefully considering the colors and materials of the building we specified a special brick for the exterior walls, which was to be used with colored mortar. When the specification was reviewed by the Municipal Architect's office, an alternate was included calling for common brick from Occoquan laid up in ordinary mortar. This alternate was accepted when the contract for construction was let.

Soon after construction started we met with Mr. Hutson and Mr. Givotovsky and pointed out the omission of the colored mortar under the alternate. They agreed that a Change Order would be issued requiring the use of colored mortar, and also that the tower of the building would be painted black as a substitute for the black brick which we had originally specified.

We later selected a colored Flamingo mortar and made two trips to the site to see sample panels, one of which we approved.

We understand that the masonry contractor at this time submitted proposals for the use of colored mortar ranging from \$2,200.00 to \$2,600.00 in addition to his original contract price. We saw one itemized explanation of this figure which included an item of over eight hundred dollars for extra mixing time, two hundred and fifty dollars for a second mixer, etc.

We have talked to several masonry contractors (including William Nelson, one of the largest in Washington), about the cost of using colored mortar. These contractors agree that if they were asked to

December 11, 1956

General T. A. Lane
District Commissioner
With and E. Stevens, W. A.
Washington, D. C.

Dear General Lane:

A question has come in connection with the design of the new building under construction at 2000 and 17th Streets, N.W. The design is an important building and we should like to have the best design possible. We have discussed the matter with Mr. H. H. H. H.

When the first of the building was started by the firm of H. H. H. H., the Commission stated in a letter to the firm that the firm had considered the architect's design and found it to be a good design. The firm had indicated promising designs for the building. In their opinion, the success of this building will depend upon careful consideration of the architects through the supervision, effort to achieve harmony and beauty of color, and careful installation of materials.

After carefully considering the design and materials of the building we specified a special price for the building which was to be used with colored mortar. When the specifications were received from the firm of H. H. H. H., an alternative was indicated calling for colored mortar. This alternative was rejected from consideration as it was an ordinary mortar. This alternative was rejected when the contract for construction was let.

Soon after construction started we met with Mr. H. H. H. H. and Mr. Givovatsky and pointed out the omission of the colored mortar. They agreed that a colored mortar would be a better design. The use of colored mortar and also the use of the building would be painted black as a substitute for the black brick which had originally specified.

We later advised a colored building mortar and made two proposals the site to see sample panels, one of which we approved.

We understand that the design committee at this time is making proposals for the use of colored mortar. The design committee is making an examination of the design which included an item of eight hundred dollars for extra work. The design committee is making a second minor, etc.

We have talked to several masonry contractors (including Nelson, one of the largest in Washington) about the cost of colored mortar. These contractors agree that it may be saved.

change from plain mortar to Flamingo mortar they would add only the difference in cost between the mortars.

The Fire House involves about 34,000 brick, backed up with two four-inch thicknesses of block. We recommend that the entire thickness of the outside wall be laid up in colored mortar in order to avoid any double scaffolding or double mixing. We are told that the construction of the full twelve-inch thickness of wall, including the 34,000 brick and the backup block, would require approximately 238 bags of mortar. Flamingo colored mortar costs \$1.77 per bag, or 71 cents more than plain mortar. The extra cost involved therefore should be about \$169.00, plus profit and overhead.

We are taking up your time with this review of the facts because we believe that the principle involved is of great interest to the people of Washington. Is it important that the public buildings of the District be well-designed buildings, or is good design to be compromised and sacrificed for the sake of very minor economies? Furthermore, shall the exorbitant demand of a sub-contractor be allowed to damage the design of a public building? These questions will presumably arise many times on future D. C. building projects, so we believe that it is important that a policy be established.

We have discussed this matter with the American Institute of Architects, the Washington-Metropolitan Chapter of the A. I. A., and the Fine Arts Commission. All of these organizations are much concerned about the principle involved. They agree with us on the importance of the District of Columbia's being represented by well-designed public buildings. It was to call attention to this need that the Fine Arts Commission placed special emphasis on the importance of color and texture in the building which we are discussing.

We should like to urge your serious consideration of this matter.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Robert C. Deigert

/s/ David Norton Yerkes

General T. A. Jones
October 11, 1916

change from plain water to filtered water would add only the difference in cost between the two.

The Fine House involves about 34,000 cubic feet of four-inch thickness of block. The reason was that the entire basement of the outside wall be laid on the colored mortar in order to give a double reinforcing in double layer. It was found that the construction of the full twelve-inch thickness of wall, founded on the 34,000 cubic feet and the basement block, would require a expenditure of 228 days of work. Flamingo colored mortar costs \$1.75 per bag, or 11 cents more than plain mortar. The entire cost involved therefore should be about \$199.00 plus profit and overhead.

We are taking up a very fine job in this review of the facts because we believe that the principle involved is of great interest to the people of Washington. It is important that the public buildings of the District be well-designed buildings, and it is not feasible to be so neglected and sacrificed for the sake of very minor economy. Furthermore, shall the exorbitant demand of a sub-contractor be allowed to govern the design of a public building? These questions will necessarily arise when there is future D. C. building projects, so we believe that it is important that a policy be established.

We have discussed this matter with the American Institute of Architects, the Washington Metropolitan Chapter of the A. I. A., and the Fine Arts Commission. All of these organizations are much concerned about the principle involved. They agree with us on the importance of the District of Columbia's being represented by well-designed public buildings. It was so called attention to this and the Fine Arts Commission placed special emphasis on the importance of color and texture in the building which we are discussing.

We should like to urge your serious consideration of this matter.

Very truly yours,

Respectfully,
J. Edgar Hoover

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover
Washington, D. C.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

20 December 1955

Mr. M. A. Coe, Supervising Architect
Department of Buildings and Grounds
300 Indiana Avenue, N. W.
Washington 1, D. C.

Dear Mr. Coe:

At a meeting on 9 December 1955, the Commission of Fine Arts considered preliminary plans for a building to house Engine Company No.32 -- Rescue Squad No.3, Fire Department, at 24th and Irving Street, Southeast, in accordance with plans accompanying your letter of 6 December 1955.

The Commission approved the design in general. The members considered the architects had cleverly solved the problem and had indicated promising designs for the facades. In their opinion, the success of this building will depend upon careful cooperation with the architects through the supervisory period to achieve texture and harmony of color, and careful installation of materials.

The plans and rendering have been returned to your office.

Sincerely yours,

L. R. Wilson
Secretary

Exhibit G

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C.

December 1934

Mr. M. A. Cox, Chairman, Committee
Department of Buildings and Planning
300 Indiana Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Cox:

At a meeting on December 1934, the Committee on the
considered preliminary plans for a building for the Bureau of Land
Management, at 300 Indiana Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.
The plans were presented by Mr. M. A. Cox, Chairman, Committee
on the Buildings and Planning, Department of Buildings and Planning,
Washington, D. C.

The Committee expressed its opinion on the plans. The members
considered the building as a whole, and the individual parts, and
indicated preliminary suggestions for the building. The Committee
the success of this building will depend upon careful consideration
with the architect through the engineering, and to achieve
feature and nature, of color, and careful attention to details.

The plans and rendering have been referred to my office.

Sincerely yours,

L. B. Wilson
Director

December 14, 1956

Deigert and Yerkes Associates
3205 N Street, Northwest
Washington 7, D. C.

Gentlemen:

I regret that the extended sessions of the Planning Commission required me to cancel the appointment which had been made for you yesterday. I read your letter of December 11, 1956, very carefully. You have shown the issues very clearly, and I think I can tell you where we stand on them.

You pose two specific questions. First, is the good design of buildings to be compromised for minor economies? The answer is clearly no. We recognize the enduring character of these structures and the importance of achieving the finest possible appearance within the general limits of design imposed by our budget. As a matter aside on your particular experience, I might inform you that I have not been satisfied with the cost controls of design which our Department of Buildings and Grounds has exercised in recent years. I think we can do better in the future by placing more of this responsibility on the architects. Our object will be to work closely with you. I can assure you that my objective is not to achieve savings, but to establish responsible control of design which is essential to sound fiscal management.

Your second question is whether the exorbitant demands of a subcontractor should be allowed to damage the design of a public building. Again, the answer is no. Under our contracts the Government reserves the right to order the work at what it considers a fair price if agreement cannot be reached. The contractor's recourse then is to the appeal procedures provided in the contract. Therefore, the decision on cost is related not to what the contractor asks, but to what the contracting officer finds to be a fair price for the additional work rendered.

I do not understand why Mr. Hutson, Mr. Givotovsky and Mr. Coe failed to modify this contract, as they had indicated to you that they would modify it. We realize now that both Mr. Hutson and Mr. Givotovsky were seriously ill in the months preceding their deaths, and that Mr. Coe had to carry an unusual burden. At the present time the work has proceeded to a point where a change of mortar would be undersirable in this building.

Exhibit H

October 14, 1955

Deputy and General Assistant
3205 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

I regret that the extended session of the Executive Committee requested me to cancel the appointment which had been made for you yesterday. I read your letter in December 1954, and I am sorry you have shown the issues very clearly, and I think I can tell you where we stand on them.

You pose two excellent questions. First is the need for buildings to be completed on time. The answer is clearly no. We recognize the economic character of these buildings and the importance of maintaining the best possible management within the general limits of design imposed by our budget. As a result, aside on your particular experience, I might inform you that I have not been satisfied with the cost control of buildings in the past. The management of buildings and grounds has experienced a record of failure. We can do better in the future by taking some of the responsibility on the architect. Our object will be to get a better job done. I can assure you that my objective is not to achieve savings, but to establish responsible control of design which is essential to sound financial management.

Your second question is whether the executive committee of a subcommittee should be allowed to determine the design of a building. Again, the answer is no. When a building is designed, the architect reserves the right to order the work as he considers a fair price is a payment cannot be made. The architect's position then is to the general procedure outlined in the contract. Therefore, the decision on cost is related to the contract and not to what the committee wishes to do. It is a fair price for the building and work required.

I do not understand why Mr. Hester, Mr. Glavinovich and Mr. Lee failed to modify the contract, as they had indicated to you that they would do so. He realized now that Mr. Hester and Mr. Glavinovich were not in the building and that Mr. Lee was not. I am sorry that Mr. Lee had to carry on under the contract. The contract was not a good one, and it was a pity that it was not revised before it was signed.

Deigert and Yerkes Associates
December 14, 1956

page 2

Where the contract for architects' services does not include Title II supervision, the Government does not feel that it is entitled to call upon architects for services during the construction period. Accordingly, minor changes in the course of construction are worked out by our own architects. I understand, and I am grateful for, your continuing interest in a building that you have designed and assure you that we shall continue to welcome such informal coordination and advice as the designers are willing to provide.

I am sure you realize also that Mr. Blaser and Mr. Guard assumed their new duties under very difficult circumstances, and that they have much to do in improving administration of the Department. I'm sure that your understanding cooperation will do much to ease their burden and to speed the day when we do have better administration.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ T.A.Lane
Brigadier General, U.S.Army
Engineer Commissioner

Deputy and Vice President
December 14, 1957

There are common to organizations, services are not limited
Title II supervision, the Government has been in the
entire to call upon architects for services during the construction
period. Accordingly, when a contract is made for the purpose of construction
period, they are covered out by our own architects. I understand, and I am
grateful for, your continuing interest in a building that is
designed and assure you that we shall continue to welcome a
formal coordination and advice as the building is being
provided.

I am sure you realize also that the Board and I. I have learned
their new duties under very difficult circumstances, and I am
have had to do the supervising administration of the department. It
sure that your understanding and cooperation will be most helpful
burden and to speed the day when we have better a building.

Sincerely yours,

(s) T. J. Lane
President, General U.S. Army
Engineer, Department

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

December 17, 1956

Dear Mr. Corey:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts were glad to meet with you and Mr. Horace Peaslee at their meeting yesterday and to have you present sketches for the proposed remodeling of the building at 615 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest for use as the International Business Machine's Vanguard Computing Center.

After the Commission examined the drawings of the existing building, and the sketch of the proposed facade, a visit was made to the site. We are fully aware of the desire of the International Business Machines to maintain a uniformity of design in all their buildings over the country, but we also have the duty of maintaining as much harmony as possible in the appearance of Pennsylvania Avenue which, over the years, has tended toward a use of limestone facing. We believe therefore that the color and material of your proposed renovation should not depart from the color and material established by use for the government buildings on Pennsylvania Avenue. Accordingly, we recommend that further consideration be given to the repair and remodeling of the existing front in limestone. We believe that a simplification of the central motif and the execution of the two end bays could be carried out in limestone and still enable you to achieve the window pattern that you desire.

We hope you will restudy the facade from this viewpoint and submit new sketches. We recognize that time is important, and Mr. Wilson, the Secretary, will take steps to have a decision reached in as short a time possible after the design is received. You will of course also have to observe the formalities required by the District Department of Licenses and Inspections, before they will issue formal clearance on your drawings.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Mr. E.H.Corey
Coordinator of Personnel
International Business Machines Corp.
1111 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

Exhibit I

10-11-1995

For the Commission

Mr. E.H. Cohn
Coordinator of Personnel
International Business Machines Corp.
1111 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

APPENDIX 3

12. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS (formal):

- SL 1933 508 Md. Ave., SW (Repaint existing sign with new wording, 4' x approx. 16') for Gulf Oil Corp. Gas. station.
- SL 1934 2601 Conn. Ave., NW (Approval requested of illuminated sign which CFA approved as non-illuminated sign--in place) for Uptown Music Center.
- SL 1935 1005 D St., NW (Re-erect existing 48.125 sq-ft, neon sign which was taken down so front could be renovated) for D. J. Kaufman, Inc.
- SL 1936 625 Penna. Ave., NW (Replace plate glass & repair show window base damaged by auto) for Atlantic Lunch.
- SL 1937 4405 Colo. Ave., NW (Construct a rear porch "no roof" with W. I. railing) for Blagden Homes, Inc.
- SL 1938 403-10th St., NW (1 25-sq-ft, single-faced, gold neon sign) for Tanen Sales Co.
- SL 1939 5728 Oregon Ave., NW (Reverse plan in order to avoid an expensive
R 1892 retain. wall next to garage which would adjoin a 12' cut in exist.
(Plans bank & fence. Reversing plan gives a 25' ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~allow~~ ^{to} permit grad-
in 1891) ing away from 12' cut in bank) for Samuel M. Badian.
- SL 1940 1 Indiana Ave., NW (2 single-faced, 12 sq-ft each, neon signs) for National Savings & Trust Co.
- SL 1941 2635 EYE St., NW (Alterations & addn. to exist. dwelling; entrance steps & porch will project beyond bldg. line) for Harold. L. Boutin.
- SL 1942 7000 Oregon Ave., NW (1-story, brick & cinder-block dwelling) for Mr & Mrs C. E. Barrows.

PENDING:

- SL 1825 230-22nd St., NW (3-story office bldg.) for National Assn. of Life Underwriters. Held for revised design.
- SL 1913 2017 Va. Ave., NW (1 single-faced, 25 sq-ft neon sign) for Drive-
R 1893 In Radio Service gas station. Held for revised design.

S. SHIPBOARD-LIGHT AND SUBMISSIONS (Toward):

- ST 1933 308 NW Ave., NW (Repairing existing sign with new wording, 4' x 8' approx. 16' for Gulf Oil Corp. Gas. station.)
- ST 1934 2501 Corn. Ave., NW (Approval requested of illuminated sign which CTA approved as non-illuminated sign--in place) for Uptown Market Center.
- ST 1935 1005 D St., NW (Re-erect existing 42.125 sq-ft, neon sign which was taken down as front could be renovated) for E. L. Kammann, Inc.
- ST 1936 625 Tenn. Ave., NW (Replace plate glass & repair snow window base damaged by auto) for Atlantic Lumber.
- ST 1937 4405 Colo. Ave., NW (Construct a rear porch and roof with W. L. railing) for Blagden Homes, Inc.
- ST 1938 403-10th St., NW (1 25-sq-ft, single-faced, gold neon sign) for Tamen Sales Co.
- ST 1939 5728 Oregon Ave., NW (Reverse plan in order to avoid an expensive retain. wall next to garage which would add to a 12' cut in exist. bank & fence. Reversing plan gives a 25' to permit grad- ing away from 12' cut in bank) for Samuel M. Berman.
- ST 1940 1 Indiana Ave., NW (2 single-faced, 12 sq-ft each, neon signs) for National Savings & Trust Co.
- ST 1941 2635 EXH St., NW (Alterations & addns. to exist. dwelling; entrance steps & porch will project beyond side line) for Harold L. Rostin.
- ST 1942 7000 Oregon Ave., NW (1-story, brick & cinder-block dwelling) for Mr. & Mrs. C. E. Barrows.
- ST 1943 230-232nd St., NW (3-story office bldg.) for National Assn. of Life Underwriters. Held for revised design.
- ST 1944 2017 Ave. Ave., NW (1 single-faced, 25 sq-ft neon sign) for Drive-In Radio Service Gas station. Held for revised design.

THINKING:

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
24 January 1957

ORDER OF BUSINESS

- 9:30 a.m. 1. CONVENE, ROOM 7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
- 9:32 a.m. 2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS:
- (a) Minutes of meeting 10 October 1956
 - (b) Minutes of meeting 19 November 1956
 - (c) Minutes of meeting 13 December 1956
- 9:33 a.m. 3. DATE OF NEXT MEETING - 14 March 1957 (?)
- 9:35 a.m. 4. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 13 DECEMBER MEETING (See Appendix 1).
- 9:40 a.m. 5. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 13 DECEMBER MEETING (See Appendix 2).
- 9:45 a.m. ✓ 6. NATIONAL MONUMENT COMMISSION - FIVE FREEDOMS MEMORIAL:
Report by Mr. de Weldon of visit to view models -
Explanation by Mr. Harry T. Thompson of National Capital Parks.
- 10:15 a.m. ✓ 7. BRIDGE/TUNNEL AT CONSTITUTION AVENUE OVER THE POTOMAC RIVER - Status - Report of meeting with Federal City Council.
- 10:30 a.m. 8. FINE ARTS LEGISLATION:
- ✓ (a) H. R. 2512 - A bill to amend the Act of May 17, 1910, with respect to the composition and activities of the Commission of Fine Arts.
 - ✓ (b) National Arts Council's report on draft of H. R. 2512.
 - ✓ (c) Congressman Thompson's letter to Executive Office of the President.
 - ✓ (d) Health, Education & Welfare Department's draft bill for Federal Advisory Council on the Arts.
- 10:45 a.m. 9. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS (Preliminary):
- ✓ (a) National Guard Assn. Bldg., northwest corner of Mass. Ave. & No. Capitol St., NW (Mr. J. P. Callmer, Mr. B. D. Elam of Justement, Elam and Darby)

6.2

✓(b) Associated General Contractors Bldg., northeast corner of 20th & E St., NW - Report on recommended changes.

✓(c) Vanguard Computing Center (IBM Corp.), 615 Pa. Ave., NW - Review revised design.

11:15 a.m. 10. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS (formal) (See Appendix 3).

11:30 a.m. ✓11. NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION - Land Acquisition (See Appendix 4).

11:40 a.m. 12. DEPARTMENT OF STATE SUBMISSION:

✓(a) Report on gift from the United States to government & people of the new republic, Ghana, to be made through the State Dept. of a bronze replica of the bust of Abraham Lincoln by J. H. K. Bush-Brown in the Lincoln Museum.

11:45 a.m. 13. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS: (Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Associate Superintendent; Mr. Wm. Haussmann, landscape architect of National Capital Parks)

✓(a) Netherlands Carillon design and site.

12:15 p.m. 14. AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION SUBMISSIONS: (Mr. John Harbeson, architect of Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson)

✓(a) West Coast Memorial, San Francisco

✓(b) East Coast Memorial, Battery Park, New York

1:00 p.m. LUNCH IN SECRETARY'S DINING ROOM

1:55 p.m. RECONVENE, ROOM 7000 INTERIOR DEPT. BLDG.

2:00 p.m. 15. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS: (Mr. Gerard I. Sawyer, Chief, Office of Planning, Design & Engineering; Mr. Joseph H. Tormey, Architect of Baltimore, Md.)

✓(a) Anacostia Freeway Bridge over Pennsylvania Avenue

✓(b) Letter from General Lane re Southwest Freeway

2:30 p.m. 16. GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE SUBMISSIONS:

✓(a) Central Intelligence Agency Bldg. - Mr. L. L. Hunter, Asst. Commissioner for Design & Construction, Public Buildings Service; Mr. Max Abramovitz of Harrison & Abramovitz, architects; Mr. Harbin S. Chandler, Col. L. K. White, of Central Intelligence Agency.

(b) State Department Annex - Mr. T. Clifford Noonan of Graham, Anderson, Probst & White, architects; Mr. Malcolm R. Stirton, Mr. Ed Laird of Harley, Ellington & Day; Mr. Marshall Fredericks, sculptor.

(1) Exterior Courts.

(2) Sculpture.

3:45 p.m. 17. TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT: Proposed Medal for United States participants, Olympic Games, Australia, 1956. (Letter from Hon. W. H. Brett, Director of the Mint.

4:15 p.m. 18. D. C. SUPERVISING ARCHITECT SUBMISSION:

(a) Proposed Elementary School at 6th and Chesapeake St., NW.

4:30 p.m. 19. MEMORIAL TO GENERAL JOHN J. PERSHING - Status.

4:45 p.m. 20. FINE ARTS LEGISLATION (Continued) (See Appendix 5)

1. The first part of the document is a list of the names of the members of the committee who have been appointed to the various sub-committees. The names are listed in alphabetical order of the last name.

2. The second part of the document is a list of the names of the members of the committee who have been appointed to the various sub-committees. The names are listed in alphabetical order of the last name.

3. The third part of the document is a list of the names of the members of the committee who have been appointed to the various sub-committees. The names are listed in alphabetical order of the last name.

4. The fourth part of the document is a list of the names of the members of the committee who have been appointed to the various sub-committees. The names are listed in alphabetical order of the last name.

5. The fifth part of the document is a list of the names of the members of the committee who have been appointed to the various sub-committees. The names are listed in alphabetical order of the last name.

6. The sixth part of the document is a list of the names of the members of the committee who have been appointed to the various sub-committees. The names are listed in alphabetical order of the last name.

7. The seventh part of the document is a list of the names of the members of the committee who have been appointed to the various sub-committees. The names are listed in alphabetical order of the last name.

